

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the Application, and claims 1, 2, and 4 are amended solely for clarification. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance in view of the above clarifying amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the personal interview conducted on July 8, 2003. Applicants' undersigned representative respectfully submits that that interview was beneficial in helping the Examiner understand the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art on which she has been relying.

In particular, claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Siegrist et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,792,483, and claims 2-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Siegrist in view of Rosato's Injection Molding Handbook, 3rd Edition. Applicants traverse the rejections to the extent they were maintained in the outstanding, final Office Action.

As was explained during the interview, according to the claimed invention, a correction value is calculated based on a difference between detected velocity data and target velocity data in a first cycle of operation, and that calculated correction value then is used to generate command data for a second or subsequent cycle of operation.¹ In Siegrist, in contrast, there is absolutely no disclosure whatsoever that teaches or suggests calculating a correction value based on a determined difference between detected and target velocity data in one cycle of operation and then using that correction value in generating command data for second or subsequent injection cycles of operation. Rather, all Siegrist discloses is the ordinary concept of feedback-based control, which may be taking place at any one specific instant of time. The general concept of feedback-based control is exceedingly well known in the art; it is not, however, what the present Application pertains to. Therefore, the Siegrist reference is simply irrelevant.² Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request that they be withdrawn.

¹ Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the previously recited first and second injection operations refer to first and second cycles of injection operation. Applicants respectfully submit that one having skill in the art would have understood the claims to be referring to such cycles of operation from, for example, page 6, line 36 through page 7, line 1, which describes the user-set target waveform pattern shown in Figure 6 for a velocity profile as having associated user-set data D12 which "specifies an operation." Applicants respectfully submit that other specific passages in the Application, as well as the overall teaching of the Application, make clear that the claim-recited operations are cycles of operation, as clarified by the present amendment.

² As explained during the interview, the disclosure at column 9, lines 10-30 to which the Examiner referred in the previous Office Action is irrelevant. All that passage indicates is that a parabolic function (the square root of the difference between actual and measured pressure values) is used in calculating feedback-controlled command signals. In other words, the feedback control is not based on the simple difference between command and actual pressure values; it is based on the square root of the difference between actual and target pressures. That says

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, and timely Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



KENNETH M. FAGIN

Reg. No. 37615

Tel. No. (703) 905-2066

Fax No. (703) 905-2500

Date: July 22, 2003
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000

nothing with respect to calculating a correction value for use in one cycle of operation based on differences determined in a preceding cycle or cycles of operation.